The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. III.—No 13. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1862. WHOLE NUMBER 117.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above *Harpers' Buildings*) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON R. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

☞ Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

THE TRENT AFFAIR, AGAIN.

OUR REVIEW OF IT CRITICISED.

Having freely expressed our own views of the "Trent affair," we as freely give our readers an opportunity to see what can be said on the other side. The following is from the *Northern Independent*, Auburn, N. Y.

MR. SUMNER AND MR. GOODELL ON THE TRENT AFFAIR.

In the war news on our first page, is the outline of a speech of Mr. Sumner, in support of the course pursued by the Administration, touching the surrender of Mason and Slidell.—His argument is not materialy different from that used by Mr. Seward, namely—the consonance of the British demand with the American doctrine of neutral rights. He thinks we have gained much. The editor of the Principia, Mr. Goodell, takes a similar view. He says;

"Under the over-ruling providence of God, Capt. Wilkes, by the capture of Mason and Slidell, and the British Government, by its extraordinary demand, have enabled our Government to secure a virtual recognition of *our* neutral rights; a victory which fifty years' negociation, and three years of war were unable to achieve. We accept it as a providential boon. We clutch it as a profitable bargain, of which the price we pay is the powder that brought to the Trent, and the surrendery of the two released culprits, whose detention was not worth to us their board."

We have not, thus far, been able to see the wisdom [or the profit of this step. Much as we rejoice to escape from a war with England, now or at any time, we cannot approve of the position taken, nor deem it otherwise than a calamity to purchase peace at so costly a price.

It is true that England, in one particular, has come upon our own ground—at a critical moment she has forced us to regard our own detestable doctrine. For half a century we used our miserable buccanier code to shield the abominable slave trade, and we have no reason to complain that England, at last, imitates our meanness, and uses the same code to protect rebel slaveholders. England has as good a right to be mean as we have, and if we insist on making our flag a passport for slavery, she is not to be blamed for making her's a passport for rebellion. We are glad that England has thrust our own chosen doctrine down our throats, for if we will be the patrons and protectors of villainy, we ought not to complain of the same conduct in others. It is fair that we should reap what we sow. When England was trying to extirpate the horrible slave trade, we—through love of slavery—resisted her beneficent efforts, by affecting a great concern for the honor of our flag, and now that we are trying to put down a wicked rebellion, she—through love of cotton—may with equal propriety affect great concern for her maritime rights. But the agreement of two nations to do wrong, does not convert wrong into right.—Our slave trade sheltering villainy is just the same that it was when England protested against it, and her treatment of us is none the less detestable, because she follows our example. How our brother of the Principia can look upon the establishment of such a doctrine touching the rights of neutrals as a "profitable bargain," we are at a loss to know. To us, it appears in the light of a mere license of villainy—a bit of clutching policy fastened upon us by unconscionable slaveholders, and utterly unworthy of a christian nation.

If this demand for the surrender of Mason and Slidell is understood to be a concession to us of the points singly and solely involved in the dispute which brought on the last war with England, then we may be considered to be gainers. In that matter we were probably right, but in this, most certainly wrong.

Mr. Sumner says that we object to the right of a commander to step upon the deck of a neutral ship, and make himself sole judge of what is contraband—all which is very true, but nevertheless sometimes necessary, if we would not have our flag a cover to villainy. A policeman in search of thieves, may occasionally arrest an honest man, but such an accident is no valid argument against the institution of civil authority; nor is the possible wrong doing of a commander, in exercising the right of search on a neutral vessel, a valid argument against the right of search itself. It is not always safe to infer from the abuse of a thing, that the thing itself is not good, as even the Gospel might be condemned by such a rule of judgment.

On the sea, not less than on the land, a stringent police must be maintained, and the principles of justice enforced. If, in doing this, England was once unwise, it is no reason why she or we should abandon so important a branch of international police.

On the whole, though we are only too happy to be exempted from worse difficulties than we now have on hand, we must deplore the triumph of that mean, anti-search doctrine, which we have so long advocated at the bidding of slaveholders, and at the sacrifice of all decent regard for the rights of man.

REMARKS ON THE PRECEDING.

1. The reader of the brief extract from the *Principia*, will fail to understand our position, unless he reads the entire article. Our good brother of the *Northern Independent*, must, we think, have overlooked or forgotten it, or he would not have written precisely as he has done.

When he concedes that in "the dispute which brought on the last war with England, we were probably right," he concedes the only point in which it seems possible for him to differ from us, if he understands our meaning. We said nothing in favor, but much against the conduct of Great Britain in the Trent affair. We said nothing in favor of making "our flag a passport for the slave-trade."

2. The *Northern Independent* mistakes, in making no distinction between the three views of Mr. Seward, Mr. Sumner and the *Principia*.

Mr. Seward took the ground that the action of Com. Wilkes was all right, except in this, that, instead of taking Mason and Slidell from on board the Trent, he should have seized the vessel, passengers, cargo, and all, and taken them into port for adjudication, because a regular legal process was necessary, and a Naval Commander had no authority to decide the matter, especially as his own Government was a party concerned. He held, however, that the Trent had no legal right to take the emissaries and their dispatches on board: they being contraband of war; from which it follows, that by regular legal adjudication, had it been held, the action of the commander of the Trent, in taking them on board as passengers, should have been condemned, and the emissaries not given up.

Mr. Sumner goes farther. He holds not only that Com. Wilkes had no legal right to act as judge in the case, but that the Commander of the Trent had a legal right to take the passenger emissaries and dispatches on board—and that a Court of adjudication should have thus decided, and released the vessel, cargo and passengers, including Mason and Slidell, and their dispatches, as *not* being "contraband of war."

The *Principia*, January 11th, (in the article commented upon by the *Northern Independent*,) agreed with both Mr. *Seward* and Mr. *Sumner*, in this *one thing*, namely, that, under the circumstances of the case, there was a *legal necessity*, under the laws of nations, as held by the American Government, and by all the European Governments, (*except by Great Britain hitherto,*) to give up Mason and Slidell. And we believed the American doctrine to be right, thus far, that such cases should be adjudicated by authorized courts, not by naval commanders. The contrary usage, by Great Britain, had fully illustrated its inherent despotism and injustice.

We said, too, what the *Northern Independent* seems to admit, that under the Providence of God, we had secured the recognition of neutral rights long denied to us, and were therefore gainers by the transaction.

In other respects, the *Principia* occupied a considerable portion of the same article in showing up the *moral* obliquity of the British Government, in its manner of using, or rather abusing, its acknowledged *legal* rights. To guard against misapprehension, we illustrated our meaning, by a parallel case in private life, in which a pretended friend made use of his *legal* right of highway, to do a very mean and unfriendly thing to a neighbor in distress. This *moral* aspect of the case, was passed over by *Mr. Seward*, and was but lightly hinted at, by Mr. Sumner.

Afterward, when Mr. Sumner had given his views, we took occasion, in the *Principia* of Jan. 18, to commend his learning, ability, and correctness in expounding both the British and the American doctrines. But we took care to say that we were not prepared to endorse his proposal to abolish all contraband of war, or even to say that belligerent, or rebel emissaries and their dispatches, should not be regarded as contraband.

Thus plainly marked were the differences between the three views—those of *Mr. Seward*—those of *Mr. Sumner*—and those of the *Principia*, which the *Northern Independent* inadvertantly classifies together, and deals with as one.

3. It never occurred to us that the discussion required of us any reference to the right of search, in the case of suspected Slavers. Our own Government has united with the British Government, and other Governments in proscribing the Slave trade as piracy. And we supposed it an established law of nations, that every nation has a right to suppress the pirates of all nations, or of no nations. When, therefore, our Government declined conceding to Great Britain a right of search for Slavers—when Democratic Senators, first, and Republican Senators (Seward, Hale &c.,) afterward, were clamorous against the exercises of that right, a few years since, we condemned their course. We are sorry to add, however, that the horrible abuses of the right of search by Great Britian, years before, gave force in the popular mind, to their eloquence.

The doctrine of neutral rights is no "buccanier code." Our brother of the *Northern Independent* should remember his own maxim that "*It is not safe to infer from the abuse of a thing, that the thing itself is not good.*"

The common and equal right of nations to the high seas, as the highway of nations, is a sacred right. America may abuse it in one case, England in another; but the right remains. I am not to deny to my neighbor his right to the high-way, nor illegally sieze his horses and drag scoundrels out of his wagon, who were on an errand of mischief against me, though I may make free to think, and say that that neighbor was acting dishonorably toward me.

ANOTHER CRITICISM.

Having heard and considered the criticism of our Auburn contemporary who thinks that we treated the British Government too *leniently*, we now take up the criticism of our Canadian friend, who thinks that we treated the British Government with too much *severity*.

LETTER FROM CHARLES STUART.

LORA, CANADA WEST, Jan. 20th, 1862.

Rev. Wm. Goodell,

MY DEAR FRIEND: I have been pained at the strictures

in your 113th No. of Jan. 11th on the Trent affair; but regarding them as one of those patriotic errors into which lovers of their country, are naturally liable to fall, I feel that this difference between you and me, may be borne by us both, without any alienation. So let it rest.

But I wish to point out to you, one striking oversight in your judgments of the British people towards you.

You, *as a people I mean*, are indignant that *they* (i. e., the British) have not united cordially with you against the most base and criminal rebellion with which you are contending. But how could they have united cordially with you, while, as literally and more dangerously than the rebels themselves, you are putting forth your utmost strength in favor of chattel slavery, with all its unutterable crimes and horrors. You love your country, your beautiful conntry!? I love it too; it is a glorious land; and your people, in talent, enterprise, perseverance, resolution, courage are not surpassed on earth. But there is something else in them. Oh horror, horror, they are *steeped, steeped, steeped*, in CHATTEL SLAVERY, and its atrocious accompaniments of slave hunting &c., and how could a Briton do aught but detest and spurn uniting with you in a cause so utterly base and criminal. No! every Briton, who is not a disgrace to his manhood, and an enemy to his country and her God, must abhor your slaveholding course; and could no more harmonize with you, while you continue to pursue such a course, than he could cringe to the lawless and insolent oppressors of the guiltless poor.

But oh, with what devotion would the British heart cleave to you in your distress, if you were fighting for lawful liberty, and not for hypocritical and tyrant power.

"But man—proud man—dressed in a little brief authority, plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven, as make the angels weep."

James 5. 1–4. "Go to, now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries which shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted; your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver are cankered, and the rest of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh, as it were fire. Ye have reaped treasure together for the last days. Behold the hire of the laborers, who have reaped down your fields, which of you, is kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them that have reaped, are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabbaoth."

Publish this, if you please, with my name; and believe me, in the ever-living, and never compromising bonds of the Gospel, Your affectionate,

C. STUART.

REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

We thank our friend for his frankness and his kindness, both of which we will endeavor to imitate.

It strikes us that, at the beginning, our friend is misdirecting his strictures. He undertook to "point out" an "oversight" in the *Principia*: and straitway proceeds to set forth the unreasonable "indignation" not of the *Principia*, but of the Americans, "*as a people.*" This seems to us, a *non-sequitur*. The *Principia* is not the American *people*, and has no especial occasion, in this matter, to defend them.

Yet it can hardly escape our notice that our friend mistakes the American "people." The British Government has neither been asked nor expected by them to "cordially unite with them, *against* the most base and criminal rebellion," though they may have erred in expecting the silent sympathy of the British people. American *abolitionists*, who are not consenting to the existence of chattel slavery, nor to the National tolerance of it, may have expected the sympathy of British *abolitionists*. Or, if neither our Government, nor the North, nor yet Northern abolitionists, were deemed worthy of the sympathy of the British people or of British abolitionists, we were certainly unprepared to expect that their sympathies would be ostentatiously and profusely lavished upon the ultra pro-slavery propogandists of the South, who were in rebellion against the Federal Government simply because it would not lead itself to the work of forcing slavery upon Kansas and the entire country in accordance with the *obiter dicta* of Judge Taney, in the case of Dred Scott. Of the British *Government* it was only expected that it would let us alone, precisely as we let them alone in their troubles with the Irish and the Chartists, *neither* of whom were struggling to overthrow both law and liberty by enthroning a military despotism of slaveholders, as *our* rebel adversaries are doing. Americans also expected that Queen Victoria's Proclamation of neutrality would be respected by her own subjects, as doubtless, *she* intended it to be, but as, assuredly, it has *not* been. And *some* Americans expected that the British Government would require its subjects to respect that proclamation of neutrality, in its *spirit* as well as in its *letter*; and that it would not hasten to take advantage of a technical legal error, committed from motives of courtesy, magnanimity, and humanity; in order to throw the American Government in the wrong, and find pretexts for war in a matter originating in a violation of that proclamation.*

We look through our friend's letter, in vain, for any admission that his Government has erred, either in omission or commission. Yet we also look through it in vain, for any attempt to show that its course was right. This may be indicative of "one of those patriotic errors, into which lovers of their country are liable to fall." Of the inconsistency of his Government in so promptly claiming rights of neutrality which, for sixty years, it had refused to concede to the American Government, our friend has nothing to say, either by way of confession, or of justification, unless we are to understand (which we can hardly suppose) that he considers that seeming inconsistency obliterated by the "horrid" fact that the American Government is still "steeped, steeped, steeped in chattel slavery" just as his own Government was, at the time when it was fighting America, in a three year's war, in vindication of the same belligerent claims which it now so promptly denies to *us*, and of which it requires of *us* a relinquishment, on pain of being involved in *another* war:—Aye "steeped, steeped, steeped" just as the British Government seems now bent upon being again "steeped," by trampling under foot its own time-honored doctrine of belligerent rights of search and seizure, for the precious pleasure of hugging to its bosom the rebel pirates, Mason and Slidell, and arranging with them for a recognition of their piratical nation!

Our Review, in the *Principia*, was not chargeable with "*an oversight*" in respect to the guilt and folly of our Government, in not making direct war against slavery. Thrice, at least, we adverted to it, in that article. We said, as we had often before said, that it was this guilty neglect that had placed us in our unhappy condition, that it had diminished our moral as well as physical power, and had emboldened the despots of Europe to join affinity with the despots of America—but we did not and we can not, in reason, nor in conscience admit that this moral dereliction of the American Government, furnishes a shadow of excuse for the moral dereliction of the British Government.

We admit that if the friends of America and of liberty in England could have pointed to our Government as being engaged in a direct war to overthrow slavery, it would have greatly strengthened them, and might have enabled them to counteract and defeat the enemies of America and of liberty in England, who, "in this instance" as we said, have controlled their Government; but this does not oblige us to disbelieve or to forget that America and that liberty have enemies in England, who, on this occasion, controlled their Government. We honor such men as George Thompson, and Richard Cobden, and John Bright, who nobly came forward and did what they could to prevent war. But that does not whitewash those who would not listen to them.

We welcome Charles Stuart's reproofs of our Government wherein it is wrong; let him not be offended with our reproofs of his, wherein it is also wrong. So also of the British people and the American people. Let each have its due praise and censure. And let not the bad and the good, of either nation be confounded with each other.

Our friend speaks of "*the British heart*" as being in sympathy with freedom. Does he mean to include the heart that controls the pro-slavery *London Times* and kindred Journals, whose sympathy with the slaveholding Oligarchy in America, incited them to stir up the national pride, the passion, the cupidity and the selfishness that is to be found in Britain as elsewhere, to fight in defence of American slavery? Was it because the editors of those papers, and Lord Palmerston and Earl Russel, and the Cottonocracy, and the Aristocracy of Great Britain were so virtuously indignant at our Federal Government and the people of the North, because instead of fighting against the existence of Southern slavery, they were only fighting against its extension by the rebellion, that on *that* account, they turned their backs upon us, and, by endorsing a virtual violation of the Queen's Proclamation of Neutrality, threw the influence of their Government into the scale of the Rebellion?

Can Charles Stuart persuade himself, or hope to convince American abolitionists, that a virtuous indignation at the pro-slaveryism of the American Government incited the British Government to demand the release of the slaveholding rebel commissioners, bound on an embassy to the British Government, in quest of a recognition of their piratical conspiracy? From a manly disgust with the partly pro-slavery and partly anti-slavery North, did it hasten to embrace the intensely pro-slavery and slaveholding South? Is this the way in which it manifested its anti-slavery virtue?

We must assure our old friend Charles Stuart that the plea is inadmissable. The plaster will neither cover nor heal the sore. The British Government has covered itself with dishonor, in the sight of the christians and philanthropists of all nations, who are now waiting to see whether it will consummate the deed, by its already half threatened recognition of the Confederacy of Pirates. *To prevent this* should be the labor of such British subjects as Charles Stuart, instead of complaining of the just and needed rebukes of his government.

We have, thus far, spoken of the British *Government* and of the pro-slavery journals and aristocratic influences that have, in this matter, controlled it. We may not stop here. Of the "British *people*" and of British abolitionists, as a class—making due exceptions—what must we say?

What less can we say than that the "*British* heart" turns out to be—as all orthodox christians might have foreseen and expected—very much the same thing, in character as the *American* heart—the *human* heart—a heart that (we speak of the masses) "goeth after its own covetousness" whenever the appropriate temptation is presented. Sympathy with the piratical Confederacy, in England, is found to be the epidemic disease of predisposed localities, the same as in America. Manufacturing Birmingham, with its "heart" of steel and cast-iron, is one thing. It goes, we hear, for the Southern Confederacy. So, probably, of Manchester, with its "heart" of cotton. Other towns not subject to similar temptations, are another thing. They are said to go for the free North. The British aristocracy, with perhaps exceptions, are found hand-and-glove with the American Aristocracy. The dependents and sycophants of British aristocracy are seen to tally well with the corresponding class, the "dough faces" of the North, in America, who court the oligarchy of slaveholders. Then, there was the unthinking populace to operate upon, whose was the patriotism of the "British flag," the Naval "supremacy of the seas," whether the contest were in favor of the doctrine of neutral rights or against it, precisely as the corresponding class in America rushed into wicked Seminole and Mexican wars, under our "stars and stripes," to the music of "*Our Country right or wrong!*"

These were the complex elements of British society upon which the *London Times* and its confederate allies operated, and raised the clamor for a war upon the American Government.

British abolitionists, like American abolitionists were not all uncompromizing, stable, and consistent with their principles. They, too, had their temptations, whether of national pride, prejudice, pecuniary interest, political partizanship, idolatry of popular statesmen, of the ruling aristocracy, of maritime supremacy, or of the national flag. It seems not to have occurred to them that the neutral rights of Great Britain in 1862, were no more sacred than were the same neural rights of America, in 1812—nor that the British use (or rather abuse) of that right to shelter the flagitious criminals of a friendly nation, was less commendable than was the American use of that same right to shelter its own innocent, unoffending citizens.

And so it came to pass that there were found British abolitionists who sympathized with the pro-slavery rebellion, against the American Government, and evidently preferred the slave states to the free! The names of Lord Shaftsbury and of Harriet Martineau may suffice as specimens of these. A British religious paper, of Anti-slavery professions, came to our table, all aflame with war articles against the North, and warm sympathy with the South. A published Letter from an English Quaker, reproaches the North

*Since

for its intermeddling with Southern institutions, and for not having bowed down still lower to the slaveholders! Unpublished private Letters from British to American abolitionists, represented that nearly all of the former were carried away with the war cry against the North, the writers themselves scarcely caring to write themselves down as exceptions. Dr. Cheever, if we mistake not, can bear testimony to this statement. Had not Dr. Cheever recently travelled and lectured in England, for the very purpose of correcting the misrepresentations of our enemies, we should have been less surprized at this state of things.

As it is, we are compelled to admit the unwelcome belief that, to a lamentable extent, the spirit of abolition in Great Britain has declined. The tone of the London *Times* had, long ago, indicated it. The New York *Herald* had boasted of it. The fact that those two malignantly pro-slavery Journals are more extensively patronized in England, and are found to have more influence with both the British Government and the British people than any other two Journals of their respective nations, is strongly indicative of such a decline.

Added to this, the fact that the pro-slavery slanderers in this country, of the workings of the British West India Emancipation act, draw their chief supplies of mendacious statistics and misrepresentations from the London *Times* and kindred English prints. Add further, the fact that the powerful pen of Thomas Carlyle, once counted chief among Britain's progressive Reformers, has, long since, been subsidized to the foul work of openly advocating the re-enslavement of the emancipated West India laborers—a work prosecuted with arts of sophistry, and resemblances to truth, that might deceive, if it were possible, even the very elect.

But facts crowd upon us, and we must pause.

We are under the necessity of saying, sorrowfully, to our old friend, CHARLES STUART, the asssociate of BUXTON and CLARKSON—the biographer of GRANVILLE SHARP, that the Britain of 1862 is not the Britain of 1832. Another generation is on the stage. Few of those with whom he once labored, remain, and those few are, for the most part, overborne. The tide of absolutism and pro-slaveryism is returning, and is sweeping over his native land. Were he young enough, he might find ample work to do there, in fighting his life battles over again.

Our American rebellion is a great test of the Christianity and of the abolitionism of both hemispheres. Its revelations are startling and astounding—none more so than the effects of the Trent affair, on the Government, the people, the Christians, the Reformers, and the abolitionists of Great Britain.

We have learned, long ago, the spuriousness of the Democracy, the Republicanism, the Christianity, that could quietly endure slavery. We have now learned, or are in process of learning, the spuriousness of the abolitionism, the Christianity, that quietly endures hereditary oligarchies, landed aristocracies, or pampered church-and-state Priesthoods, in any shape. We are learning that these, with their dependents, admirers and sycophants, are the same, in all lands, and instinctively sympathize with American slaveholders and their sycophants. We are learning that the oppressors of India, (the successors of Warren Hastings) the invaders and violent poisoners of China, the oppressors of Ireland; the persecutors of the Christian chartists, the imprisoners of Aarthur O'Neil, are not to be depended upon, in the day of trial, to sympathize with American slaves, American abolitionists, or the supporters of Government against "the most base and criminal rebellion."

There are other oppressors, besides slaveholders, and other oppressions besides chattel slavery. But they all have affinities, which, in times of trial, are revealed.

These are lessons, important though painful to be learned. The armies of Gog and of Magog, are assembling, from the four winds of heaven, for the great final battle between despotism and freedom—and it is well to know who are on the side of God and humanity.

"The kingdoms of this world are" not yet "become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ"—nor does the kingdom of Great Britain exhibit the exception, or furnish the Millennial pattern, any more than does the slaveholding republic of America.

---

*Since writing the above, it is ascertained that so early as Dec. 9, the British Government was apprized that the American Government did not authorize the capture of Mason and Slidell, was unconsulted on the subject, that it cherished the most friendly regard for the British Government, and would wait for any representation by the British Government on the subject. Yet, with this knowledge locked up, the Government commenced vigorous measures for offensive war, and foster the most rampant war spirit against America.

THE "PRACTICABLES" AND THE "IMPRACTICABLES," OR PREDICTION AND HISTORY, DURING FORTY-TWO YEARS.

[*Concluded.*]

IV. When Stephen A. Douglas, in 1854, first broached his doctrine of popular sovereignty in the Territories, the same as in the States, in respect to slavery, deducing therefrom his favorite measure of repealing the Missouri Compromise act, on the ground of its unconstitutionality and inequality, his project and his theory were derided as the dreams of a madman, throughout the States, and almost everybody said that he had made political shipwreck, and ruined his prospects for the high office for which he aspired.

How ought his proposition to have been met? On what principles of ethics and of Constitutional exposition ought he to have been answered, in order to make a sound argument, and defeat him, before Congress, and the American people?

The fanatical "*impracticables*" said he ought to be met with a denial of the claim of property in man, on the ground of its inherent criminality and consequent illegality, its unconstitutionality, including a denial of the right of any State, under the Constitution, to maintain slavery, and maintaining the corresponding right of the United States Government to prohibit slavery in the States, by enforcing the Constitutional "guaranty to every State in this Union, of a Republican form of government." The "impracticables" predicted that unless this ground of defence were occupied, Mr. Douglas would succeed, and the Missouri Compromise act be repealed. Another shout of derision at the folly of the "impracticables" went up from all the assemblies and conventions of the "practicables," and they proceeded to argue the case in their hundreds of journals, and by their scores of Senators and Representatives in Congress.

What was *their* ground of argument? They began by conceding, as usual, the Constitutional right of slavery in the *States*, at least in the *old* States, but denied it in the Territories, because under the Constitution, "The Congress shall have power to *dispose of* and make all needful rules and regulations, respecting the Territory or *other property*, belonging to the United States." The natural effect of this lame logic and loose ethics, was the triumph of Mr. Douglas, and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, in a very few months, precisely as the "impracticables" had foreseen and predicted.

Yet the "practicables"—nothing daunted, and in no degree instructed by their ill-success, continued the controversy on the old ground, continually parading their concession of the rights of the "*Sovereign States*" to maintain either free or despotic governments as they pleased, and disclaiming all intention or desire "to interfere with slavery in the *Sovereign States*," thereby recognizing, by the bye, that very doctrine of absolute "State Sovereignty," which the Confederate States, in seceding, have now claimed to exercise; but which, *when too late*, the same "practicables" have wearied themselves to deny, and to disprove; yet at the same time, still disclaiming the Federal power to protect from slavery the millions of its enslaved subjects in the States!

The result, which has now become history, it was not difficult, even for "impracticables," to foresee—nor hazardous to foretell. That result we have alluded to already, in a former article. But some of the particulars, more minutely, it may be profitable to recall.

In order to settle the Kansas difficulty, without further bloodshed, every member of the Republican party in the House of Representatives, with the advice of their associates in the Senate, gave up, for the time being, at least, their doctrine of a Congressional exclusion of slavery from the Territories, and accepted, for that emergency, the popular sovereignty doctrine of Mr. Douglas, whose friends they welcomed as fellow-laborers, in the task of claiming for the *people of Kansas*, the right of establishing either freedom or slavery, as they pleased. This only instance of Republican success, in their promised work of achieving freedom for the Territories, was won by departing, wholly, from their own platform, and adopting that of Senator Douglas.

It was not strange that when Mr. Douglas, some time after, contested with Mr. Lincoln, the Illinois Senatorship in Congress, the *N. Y. Tribune* advised the Republicans of Kansas, to drop Lincoln and vote for Douglas.

Nor was it strange that, a few days before the Republican Nominating Convention at Chicago, the Republican Committee on the Territories, with Mr. Grow at their head, proposed to organize the several new Territories, *without the anti-slavery restriction*, which measure, as said the *Tribune*, was defeated only by Democratic votes!

Nor was it strange that, at the Chicago Convention, Mr. Greeley, of the *Tribune*, labored to expunge from the Republican Creed, in the platform, the doctrine that Congress has power to exclude slavery from the Territories. Nor was it strange, that he so nearly succeeded as to prevent the clear and unambiguous declaration of the measure of Territorial restriction, from being enumerated among the objects of the party that nominated Mr. Lincoln.

Nor was it strange, that the vote of Connecticut for Mr. Lincoln, was obtained only by the adroit and timely action of the Connecticut Republican State Convention, in which they explicitly repudiated and renounced the Republican doctrine of anti-slavery restriction for the Territories, and planted themselves squarely, on the doctrine of Mr. Douglas. Nor was it strange that, all over the free States, the popular vote was solicited for Mr. Lincoln, in preference to Mr. Douglas, on the ground that the two were agreed in their sentiments, and that Mr. Lincoln had the best prospects of success. Nor is it strange that, up to this moment, a large proportion of those who are, or were Republicans, acknowledge that they have changed their views, and now accept the popular sovereignty doctrine of Mr. Douglas, as the true doctrine. And assuredly, it is not strange that even a *good* cause, (as was that of excluding slavery from the Territories), should have been defeated, by the desertion of large portions of its adherents, because they discovered that the arguments by which that cause had been advocated, were unsound and sophistical—making good the maxim, that the most dangerous enemies of the truth, and of a righteous cause, are those who espouse and advocate them, on *false grounds and by sophistries*.

In all these instances, running through a period of *forty-two years*, we have seen the persons derided as "impracticables," predicting continually, the events that have afterward taken place. And we have seen the multitudes of self-complacent politicians, who have been pluming themselves upon their sagacity as "practical" men, continually failing, in all their endeavors, and never achieving, in a single instance, any real and substantial success!

V. Yet these forty-two years of disastrous experience seem to have availed nothing toward curing these self-complacent, self-lauditory "practicables" of their supercillious bearing, their over-weening confidence in themselves and their tactics. They have, at last, succeeded in carrying a Presidential election. Their President is in the Chair, and they are having it all in their own way. But what are they doing to redeem the pledges they gave of piloting the Ship of State into the haven of peace?

Have they settled, or are they likely to settle, even to their own satisfaction, the great question of the age? What have they done? What are they in process of accomplishing? What are their plans? Or, how are they proposing to carry them forward?

The projects of the "impracticables" they said, would divide the Union, and light the torch of civil war. *They*, the "practicables," were going to manage more prudently. They were going to "conciliate our brethren of the South" by their compromises and pacifications. Have their compliances accomplished their objects? Have they prevented disunion? Have they averted civil war? No. The very reverse has taken place. Their compromises and compliances have only emboldened the slaveholders, invited aggression, and stimulated to outrage upon outrage, till disunion and civil war are the result—precisely as the fanatical "impracticables" had forewarned them.

VI. We come, at length, to the scene of the Drama now in process of enacting. We are in the midst of a civil war,

the inevitable result of the policy of "practical business men"—and they are at the head of its management.

The old controversy between the "practicables" and the "impracticables" is still going on, each class retaining its principles, its ethics, its tactics, its policy, its maxims, precisely as they were, at the beginning, and as they have been, ever since.

The "impracticables" insist that the known and acknowledged cause and incentive to the rebellion, must be crushed, in order to crush the rebellion. The "practicables" oppose this, and are carrying on the war, with the most scrupulous care to avoid interfering with the cause and source of it.

The "impracticables" say that four millions of loyal citizens at the South, in the very seat of the rebellion, who are now compelled to labor for its support, should be invited, encouraged, and enabled to assist in the deliverance of themselves and ourselves, from the yoke of our common oppressors! The "practicables" demur at this, because, forsooth, those four millions are *black*, and because, moreover, if they were invited to assist us, some twenty or thirty thousand *white* citizens, in the border States, professing to be loyal, would, forthwith, declare themselves to be rebels!

The "impracticables" insist that reason and experiment unitedly teach that liberty and slavery cannot both exist together peaceably, in this country, and that if, on any terms which recognized and tolerated slavery, a peace should be agreed upon to-day, there would be no security from war, to-morrow,—no possibility of long remaining in peace, without coming under the yoke. The "practicables," on the other hand, are still bent on restoring peace, without disturbing slavery, restoring the "Union as it was," when slavery governed the nation as it pleased! Or if (as some of them concede), the cause of the war should *happen* to do away slavery, we must do nothing directly to that end. We must put down the rebellion first, before we secure the means of putting it down. We must remove the effect before we remove the cause—must dry up the stream, before we shut up the fountain.

The "impracticables" are in favor of carrying on the war, according to the rules of war.—The "practicables" oppose this, and insist that it shall be carried on, according to the Chicago Platform, and the President's Inaugural!

The "impractibles,"—now, as heretofore,—insist that the Constitution shall be held to mean what it says, instead of being held to mean what the slaveholders say it means:—that it shall be expounded in accordance with its declared objects, and explicit provisions, rather than by the pretended and traditionary understandings of its framers; that it shall be expounded according to the legal rules of interpretation, and not in violation of them. The "practicables" demur against all this, for fear of losing the votes of the people!

The "impracticables" insist that the war should be carried on, and slavery abolished *by and under* the Constitution, just as it reads. They believe that it would be easier to gain the assent of Congress and of the people, to a *Constitutional* abolition of slavery, than it would be to gain their assent to abolition *outside* of the Constitution, and by the exercise of an extra-constitutional power. With a Constitution that not only authorizes, but *requires* the "guarantee to every State in this Union, of a Republican form of Government," whether in peace or war, they protest against the *denial* of that Constitutional requirement, while in the act of attempting emancipation under the "war power" exclusively.

The "practicables," now as formerly, continue to concede that the Constitution contains no grant of power to abolish slavery, yet are trying to compass, by some cunning indirection, the work of its "incidental" and "unintentional" abolition! They are trying to do slyly and circuitously, what the "impracticables" would do directly, openly, and above board. Now, as in their bootless struggle to exclude new slave States from the Union, or to exclude slavery from the Territories, they plead the necessity of conceding the "compromises of the Constitution," (which many, if not most of them admit, in private conversation, to have no existence in the instrument), because, say they, "*it would take fifty years to make the people understand the Constitution as it reads.*"

The "impracticables" on the other hand, now, as formerly, insist that the people have such a regard for the Constitution, and such a fear of unconstitutional, unlimited, irrepressible, military power, outside of the Constitution, (which even Senators Hale, and Wilson, and Biddle, along with Wendell Phillips, admit to be a dangerous and hazardous experiment), that it will be much more difficult to gain the assent of the people to such a process, than to one plainly and unequivocally pointed out in the Constitution.

Thus stands the controversy between the "practicables" and the "impracticables" in this year of grace, 1862.

The history of the past forty-two years, ought to be of some value to us, in enabling us to decide between them.

Thus far, the expectations of the "practicables" have, in every instance, failed; and the predictions of the "impracticables" fulfilled. How long is it likely to be, in the future?

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1862.

☞ Letters on business for the *Principia* should be addressed to M. B. Williams, the Publisher.

Letters for the Editor, whether for his consideration, or for the public, should be addressed to William Goodell.

Orders for books or pamphlets may be addressed to either of the above.

But in all cases, the *business* matter should be on a slip of paper separate from suggestions or communications for the Editor—because business papers must be kept on the Publisher's file, by themselves. For the same reason, what is designed for the Publisher should be on one slip of paper, and matter designed for the Editor's attention or use should be on another, though all may be put into one envelope, and directed to either.

☞ All letters for us should be carefully directed to 339 Pearl street, *not* to 48 Beekman street, nor to Box 1212, (the *former* address of Wm. Goodell, where some of his letters continue to be sent.) This is the more important *now*, as the office of our friends, is now removed; and letters directed there will be liable to be lost.

"COMPENSATION" PETITIONS,

THEIR EFFECT IN CONGRESS.

Any one, desiring to learn the moral and political effect of sending Emancipation Petitions to Congress, offering "*Compensation*" to "loyal" masters for their slaves, may be instructed, if not edified, by an extract from a speech of Mr. Menzies, Representative in Congress, from the "loyal" border state of Kentucky. He is speaking in reply to a speech of Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania, in which he had been offering "compensation to loyal slaveholders." We copy from the Washington Daily Globe of January 28. Mr. Menzies, said:

There was a paper published some time ago called an Ostend manifesto, which proposed forcibly to purchase somebody's land, and to pay for it a price which might be dictated by the purchaser. To be sure, that proposition was made to the foreigner—the Spaniard—and not to our own people. The gentleman from Pennsylvania now proposes forcibly to purchase my property, and to pay me his price, $150, for it. He proposes forcibly to purchase my slaves, and the slaves of loyal men in Kentucky, of men who are now fighting, desperately fighting, to preserve this Government over him, and to render his seat here stable and secure. He proposes to go to these Tennesseans and Kentuckians, who have fought, as men have never fought better at Mills Spring, to preserve this Government, and to say to them, with a pistol in one hand and $150 in the other, "Here is the price of your slave. Take it. If not you must take the consequences." The difference between the the principle which the gentleman is now advocating and the principle of his illustrious constituent* is, that the one is proposing to act thus toward his fellow-citizens who are fighting to preserve this Government, while James Buchanan proposed to do so towards foreigners.

Now, sir, how does the distinguished representative of Wheatland justify his proposition? He justifies it on the plea of necessity—the tyrants plea from the beginning of civilization. He would appoint a dictator on that plea, if it were necessary. But whenever it becomes necessary to appoint a dictator, destroy our Constitution, and take away our constitutional liberties, then the rebels have already succeeded. Then there is no more Government left. I am for standing on the Constitution, as given us by our fathers, and for resolving to put down the rebellion and preserving the Union. What do you gain by saying that you have a right to destroy the Constitution in order to put down this rebellion? To illustrate it by a homely figure, allow me to ask, what difference it would make to you, if you were going to be hanged, to have the choice between a rope and a grape-vine? The price that I am to receive for my slave thus taken from me is to be fixed only in deference to chronic error and prejudice. How long will chronic error and prejudice interpose in my behalf? Just so long as the gentlemen from Pennsylvania conceives it necessary for him to do that much. Whenever he comes to believe that he has the power to do it without remuneration to me, he will turn his back on "chronic error and prejudice."

The Constitution is my plea, Mr Chairman, and I interpose it in behalf of the loyal men of the country and of non-combatants. You have no right to violate any provision of the Constitution. In behalf of the rebel I interpose no plea whatever. I am not employed by him. I could not be employed by him. If I could be, I would be but little better than he. So far as the confiscation of his property is concerned, that is a fair subject for consultation among the friends of the Government of the United States. I am willing to go into that consultation; and when you come to a decision as to what is to be done with him and his, I expect to abide by that decision, whether it conforms to my views or not.

Several "loyal" border Statesmen had gone farther, and had declared that their states would secede, the moment that Congress should confiscate the slave property of *rebels!* Mr. Menzies is one of the most patriotic and modest of his class, and contends merely for the inalienable right of slaveholding, to the "loyal." No "compensation," is to effect the surrender of that "Constitutional" right. The very *offer* of "compensation" is si ezed upon as a concession of that righ to "property" in human flesh and bones, *Thus* fortified, Mr. Menzies stands erect and defies the House to pass an act emancipating *his* slaves. And well he may. With these two fatal concessions (1) the right of slave property and (2) the lack of Constitutional right to abolish the tenure of slave property, Mr. Menzies is secure. No Congress, it may be safe to predict, will ever abolish slavery, so long as it makes these two concessions, the first of which at least is substantially implied in the offer of "compensation" and in the petition offering it.

Slaveholders must be met on grounds more firm and solid than these. There is no right of property in man. The Constitution recognizes no such right. Mr. Madison testifies that the Convention that drafted it would not permit it to recognize any such right: and that Mr. Randolph of Virginia moved an amendment of the first draft of one of the articles, for the very purpose, distinctly announced by him, to *prevent* any such recognition—which amendment was unanimously adopted by the Convention!

Is it not high time for some member of Congress who understands these facts, (which most of them have in possession) to stand up in their places, in reply to such men as Mr. Menzies and state the whole truth as it is? And is it not high time for the friends of emancipation, to cease from interlarding their petitions with offers of compensation—or something understood to be such—thus neutralizing the force of their petitions?

Mr. Menzies evidently regards the offer of "compensation" in such a connexion an insult. And no marvel. Let us make a manly and christian appeal to their consciences, and to the Constitution *as it is*. It would be worth more, in its moral and political effect upon them, than all the concessions, compromises, and "Compensation petitions" ever showered upon them.

*Mr. Buchanan.

SIGNIFICANT FACTS TO BE PONDERED.

The policy that controls the war may be clearly understood by a brief recapitulation of a few characteristic items.

1. *Gen. Wool*, to whom, more than any military commander, the country was looking, to hold the highest post, next to Gen. Scott, was first sent off to occupy a commissary post at Albany, and when the public voice demanded his appointment to a military command, he was housed up in Fortress Monroe. Gen. Wool had had the bad reputation of not being particularly friendly to slavery.

2. *Commodore Stringham*, who took possession of Hatteras, had the imprudence to employ the help of colored refugees, in doing it, and of stating the fact to their credit, in his report. Care was quietly taken to get him put out of the active service, immediately.

3. *Gen. Fremont* proclaimed freedom to the slave of rebel slaveholders in Missouri. The proclamation was immediately modified, and in humble obedience to the demands of the pro-slavery press and the Legislature of Kentucky, he was superseded in his command, on the eve of a battle which, had it been fought, would probably have cleared Missouri

of the rebels, and open the way for the conquest of the South Western states ere this; an enterprize on which Gen. Fremont was about entering. The expected battle has never been fought, nor the projected advance made.

4. Gen. Lane proposes to enter upon the same South Western expedition that had been contemplated by Gen. Fremont, taking care to stipulate that he should be allowed to conduct the expedition in his own way, which was understood to be the employment of all recruits who would come to his banner. Just as the command is about to start, the supreme command of it is placed in the hands of Gen. Hunter, the successor of Fremont, who repels from his camp all fugitive slaves.

5. *SecretaryCameron* makes a Report in which he vindicates the policy of employing slaves to put down the rebellion. The President strikes out that part of his Report, and soon after, in obedience to renewed demands of the Kentucky Legislature, removes the Secretary from office.

6. *Gen. Sigel*, a most energetic commander, reputed to be unfriendly to slavery, was so snubbed by his superiors that it became necessary for him to resign.

7. *Gen. McClellan* who proclaimed protection to slave property in Virginia, was promoted to the command vacated by the resignation of Gen. Scott. He approves the act of his subordinate, Gen. Franklin, forbidding the Hutchinson's to sing the songs of freedom, to the soldiers.

8. *Gen. Sherman* issues a Proclamation to propitiate the slaveholding rebels of South Carolina, and forbears to push his conquests beyond the neighborhood of Fort Pulaski. Gen. Sherman appears to enjoy the confidence and approbation of the Government.

Neither the country, nor foreign countries, nor history, nor posterity, can be persuaded that all these coincidences were accidental.

Rev. Mr. Conway's Lecture.—A discourse was delivered at the church of the Puritans, (Union Square,) last evening (Thursday) by Rev. M. D. CONWAY of Cincinnati, on the subject of Slavery, as involved in the present war. The reverent speaker argued to a large and interested audience that emancipation was the only means by which the nation could be released from its present difficulties. But the powers at Washington were paralyzed and puzzled over the problem of "How not to do it," and the country dissolving into ruin. The golden moment for saving her was passing, and he urged the necessity of the people speaking in tones which should revive the President and the Cabinet, and forcing them into adobting the only policy which could be of advantage. The lecture abounded in logic and fact, and was much applauded. At the conclusion of Mr. CONWAY's discourse Rev. Dr. CHEEVER briefly spoke. He said that he was just from Washington, where he had been asked by Senators and Congressmen to return to New-York the message that an expression of the people's sentiments in mass meeting was desired by the Government. It waited to hear their views. Did they desire a decree of emancipation or not? Upon the motion of Dr. ROBERTF. HALLECK, a Committee of twenty-one persons, comprising many of our most prominent citizens, was appointed for the purpose of calling a mass meeting at an early day.—*Times.*

DR. CHEEVER'S lecture, in the Church of the Puritans, last Sabbath Evening, was more numerously attended than any of his preceeding ones; and seems to have produced a more overwhelming effect.

MICHIGAN FOR ABOLITION. The Legislature of Michigan has done their State the honor to be the first to ask the Federal Government *to sweep slavery from the land.*

What state Legislature speaks next?

Let the state Legislatures be plied with petitions for similar action.

News of the Day.

THURSDAY, JAN. 30th.

Congress.—The joint resolutions concerning secret sessions of Congress, passed both Houses yesterday, somewhat altered from their original form, but the same in the general spirit. Expulsion was made the penalty of divulging the proceedings.—*Tribune.*

The bill giving the President power over telegraph lines and railways, under certain circumstances, was passed yesterday by the House.—*Ib.*

Missouri.—We hear from Missouri, that an expedition has started from Otterville, probably with the intention of attacking Price in Springfield. The expedition has been preparing for some time. On Wednesday, one division set out, under Gen. Jeff. C. Davis; it comprised five regiments, two batteries, and three companies of cavalry. To-day or to-morrow, a second division was to move. Sharp work is looked for, and we shall have a good report from our Western soldiers. Little is known about Price. Persons supposed to be worthy of belief say that he has not fortified Springfield; he is also said to be expecting re-enforcements but in what force no one knows.—*Trib.*

Gen. Lane's expedition.—Gen. Hunter has issued an order which excites much comment in Kansas, and will call forth remark here also. It is amusingly sharp in its tone, and seems to indicate that the feelings of the General have, in some way, been touched in a sensitive part. He says in this order. that he proposes to take command in person of the expedition South—"called by the newspapers, General Lane's Expedition:" that the Government has provided no transportation, and therefore they must go without it, and that no officer or soldier shall take more raiment than he himself proposes to take—one change.—*Trib.*

Occoquan Bay.—The Thirty-Seventh New York Volunteers distinguished itself yesterday, in a skirmish with a body of Texan Rangers who were ensconced in Mrs. Lee's house, on Occoquan bay. Colonel Hayman, of the Thirty-seventh, sent out a party of fifty men, under Lieutenant Colonel John Burke, on a reconnoissance, and upon reaching the house of Mrs. Lee, they found it occupied by Texan rebels. They opened fire upon them, and killed nine of them, taking the remaining one prisoner.—*Herald.*

Articles of Foreign Manufacture.—The War Department has issued orders that no further contracts for articles of foreign manufacture shall be made; that all outstanding orders, agencies, or licenses for similar articles shall be revoked and annulled; and that all persons claiming to hold such licenses shall, within fifteen days, present their claims and give full particulars of their cases.—*Tribune.*

FRIDAY, JAN. 31st.

Europe.—By the arrival of the City of Washington with Liverpool dates to the 14th, and Queenstown to the 15th, —and the Anglo Saxon at Portland, we have two days' later news. Among the dispatches is found the diplomatic correspondence in relation to the Trent affair. We regret that for want of space, we shall be able to give only extracts from the most important documents. From a letter from Lord Russell to Lord Lyons, dated Dec. 19, we clip the following:

Mr. Seward, in a dispatch to Mr. Adams proceeds to the case of the Trent, from which ship the two insurgents had been taken. He affirms that no instructions were given to Capt. Wilkes, which authorised him to act in the manner he had done. Neither had the United States Government committed itself with regard to any decision upon the character of that act. The Government would wait for any representation the British Government might make, before coming to any positive decision. He desires that, if Mr. Adams should think it desirable, this dispatch shall be read to me, and also to Lord Palmerston.

From which it appears that our government—in a dispatch which the British Cabinet saw fit to keep private—at an early date, disclaimed all official connection with the capture of Mason and Slidell. Quite an important disclosure!

The reply of Lord Russell to Mr. Seward (addressed to Lord Lyons) after recapitulating, continues:

Her Majesty's Government, having carefully taken into their consideration the liberation of the prisoners, the delivery of them into your hands, and the explanations to which I have just referred, have arrived at the conclusion that they constitute the reparation which her Majesty and the British nation had a right to expect.

It gives her Majesty's Government great satisfaction to be enabled to arrive at a conclusion, favorable to the maintenance of the most friendly relations between the two nations. I need not discuss the modifications, in my statement of the facts, which Mr. Seward says he has derived from the reports of officers of his government.

I cannot conclude, however, without adverting, shortly, to the discussions which Mr. Seward has raised, upon points, not prominently brought into question, in my dispatch of the 30th of November. I there objected, on the part of her Majesty's Government, to that which Capt. Wilkes had done. Mr. Seward, in his answer, points out what he conceives Capt. Wilkes might have done, without violating the laws of nations.

It is not necessary that I should here discuss, in detail, the five questions ably argued by the Secretary of State; but it is necessary that I should say, that her Majesty's Government differ from Mr. Seward, in some of the conclusions at which he has arrived. And it may lead to a better understanding between the two nations, on several points of international law, which may, during the present contest, or at some future time, be brought into question, that I should state to you, for communication to the Secretary of State, wherein those differences consist; I hope to do so in a few days.

In the meantime, it will be desirable that the commanders of the United States cruisers should be instructed not to repeat acts for which the British Government will have to ask for redress, and which the United States Government cannot undertake to justify.

You will read, and give a copy of this dispatch to the Secretary of State. I am, &c., RUSSELL.

The papers are still discussing vigorously, the different phases of the Trent affair.

Congress accomplished little of importance, yesterday.

The Burnside Expedition.—Our dispatches and correspondence from Fortress Monroe, contain some additional intelligence from the Burnside Expedition. Everything, at last accounts, was progressing quite favorably. The pleasant weather now prevailing in that region, has enabled the water and tug-boats delayed at Hampton Roads, to proceed to Hatteras Inlet, where the services of the tugs will be of the greatest value. An official dispatch has also been received at the Navy Department from Commodore Goldsborough, which represents everything to be progressing favorably. He anticipates being soon "at the enemy."—*Times.*

SATURDAY, FEB. 1st.

Europe.—The Africa brings very important intelligence, dated on the 19th inst., (two days later), relative to the new phase in which the rulers of England and France were then disposed to consider the American war question, with a view to founding a basis, for a common line of policy towards this country, while engaged in the suppression of the Southern rebellion.

The Mason and Slidell case having come to an end, the "Allies" now vehemently object to the stone fleet blockade of Charleston harbor, and hint that in consequence of this act, the entire blockade of the Southern ports is likely to be impugned by the great Powers of Europe, with a view to its annihilation.

Further than this, England has openly broached the idea of an Anglo-French "intervention," in our affairs, having for its object the "pacification of the Federal and Confederate States of North America."—*Herald.*

By "England," the *Herald* probably means the "*Observer*," Lord Palmerston's organ, which proposes "intervention," &c. We trust that this will prove no more than newspaper gossip.

In Congress, no business of importance was transacted.

Lane vs. Hunter.—There appears to be some clashing between Genrals Lane and Hunter. According to a dispatch said to have been received at Washington, both of them desire to command the expedition southward. Hunter calls for $3,000,000, which Lane says he can do without. The order has, been sent to give the command to Gen. Hunter.—*Tribune.*

General Butler's expedition, with the troops on board the Constitution, has been ordered to leave Hampton Roads as soon as possible for Ship Island, at the mouth of the Mississippi, and it is not improbable that she will start to-morrow. The men are now in excellent health, after their brief rest at Fortress Monroe.—*Herald.*

Savannah.—Dispatches from Savannah, received *via* Fortress Monroe, state that our forces have succeeded in cutting off the communication between Fort Pulaski and Savannah. A skirmish had occurred with the gunboats, but without any decisive result on either side. Fort Pulaski is said to be provisioned for six months.—*World.*

MONDAY, FEB 3d.

Opinion abroad.—The war party abroad are doing their utmost to recover from the signal defeat they have suffered in the Trent case, and to avert the torrents of indignation which are heaped upon them, from all parts of the Continent. What renders them particularly open to reproach is that they have been convicted of concealing Mr. Seward's despatch of the 30th of November; which, if it had been published, would have dissipated all doubts of the peaceable disposition of this Government, and of its entire willingness to settle the Trent case in the most amicable manner. That despatch was sent to Mr. Adams early in December; we have his own words that it was read to Earl Russell; and yet, for nearly a month thereafter, the most vigorous warlike preparations were prosecuted, and the people, not only of England, but of the Continent, allowed to remain in the most painful suspense.

One of the leading French journals, *Le Temps*, describes the situation perfectly, when it says: "The truth is now as clear as day, that all Europe has been mystified, in gross and, in detail, during two months. What was the meaning of this bit of theatrical display? Why has England caused such immense armaments with such unprecedented despatch, when it was proper in the first place to await some indication of the designs of the Washington Cabinet; and still more proper, in the second place, to cease arming after the receipt of Mr. Seward's conciliatory despatch? Nothing could be lost by waiting, since the prisoners were not likely to be spirited away." The same paper adds that "public opinion in England will now react violently against the excitement raised against the United States. Lord Palmerston will be prohibited more than ever from recognising the independence of the slave states. We should advise our own journals, which have followed in the train of England, to be silent hereafter."

As to the effects of the Trent decision on public sentiment a-

broad, we are permitted to take the following extract from the private letter of a most intelligent observer:

"Since the surrender of Mason and Slidell, our position in Europe, is much better than it has been at any time before, since the rebellion. A strong reaction has set in against the South, and in our favor. I am greatly mistaken if those gentlemen don't both find a cheerless welcome in Europe. Mr. Seward's despatches are widely and strongly commended, as well as the magnanimity and sagacity of the government. The fact is, all Europe was frightened almost unto death, by the apprehension that we meant to resist, for which they everyday had increasing evidence of our ability, if we were reckless enough of consequences, about which they had not much doubt. When they found the men were delivered up, and in such a spirit, their gratitude was proportioned to their selfishness, and the feeling towards the South was changed in a corresponding degree. The northern cause now stands a great deal better in Europe than it did before the seizure. It was feared we were going to give England a triumph as the champion of the rights of neutral commerce. When it was ascertained that we had caught her in a trap, and, while vindicating our traditional policy, had brought her mouth to the bucket, every one gave our government the credit of having achieved a masterly triumph. It will now be very difficult to awaken any hostile feeling towards the North in Europe, if it in any way can promote the interests of the secession States. England has paid about £4,000,000 for a false alarm, to say nothing of the depreciation in the sale of stocks, a good many times as much more; and the government may cry 'Wolf' now as often as they please, they will not be heeded."—*N. Y. Evening Post.*

Washington Feb 2d.—*Secession agents in Canada.*—It is known here that a number of southern secessionists are in Canada whose business is to collect money from sympathizing friends and to forward and receive dispatches from Europe, and place themsin such secret channels that they may reach their ultimate destination. It is not likely that such proceedings will be much longer continued.—*Cor. World.*

Washington, Feb, 2.—*Our Foreign Relations.*—Notwithstanding the alarms and croakings of some of the foreign Journals and letter writers, about the stone blockade, and other sinister reports, the despatches received at the State Department are regarded as conclusive of a complete restoration of the *entente cordiale* between the United States and Great Britain, and of the best possible understanding of the governments of France, Italy, and other continental states.

The rumors which it is represented threw New York into a panic yesterday are regarded here as inventions of the secessionists in London and Paris. The communications which have been received from Great Britian and France, as well as other European states, by the two last steamers, are more frank and cordial than any since the insurrection began.

Exchange of Congratulations between Secretary Seward and Lord Lyons.—Yesterday, Secretary Seward and Lord Lyons exchanged congratulations on the adjustment of the Trent affair, in a spirit similar to that which in the same case animated Earl Russel and Minister Adams.—*Cor. World.*

The Legislature of New York has adopted a Resolution against the project of making U. S. Treasury Notes a legal tender.

It is hoped that an amendment, excluding that feature, will be passed in Congress.

Gen. Lane and Gen. Hunter.—The Hon. Mr. Conway of Kansas has had an interview with the President, in reference to Gen. Lane. The President stated that he made Gen. Lane a Brigadier to serve under Major Gen. Hunter: that he appointed a special staff to accompany him; that he expected him to go on the southern expedition under direction of Major Gen. Hunter, but that he hopes Major Gen. Hunter will issue such orders as will prove agreeable to Gen. Lane. It is now alleged that Gen. Hunter is as radical in his views as Gen. Lane, but that while the former wants three millions for transportation, which the President has denied him, Gen. Lane is prepared to subsist his army from the enemy.—*Tribune.*

Since the directions to Gen. Hunter by the Secretary of War to take command of the expedition from Kansas southward, Gen. Lane's friends say that he will decline further military service, and return to the Senate, it being supposed he can secure a reelection.—*Cor. Times.*

Exchanging Prisoners.—It is gratifying to know that the Government, without yielding its position towards the Confederates as rebels, has succeeded in inaugurating a regular system for exchanging prisoners. About 450 prisoners are to be released frsm Fort Warren to-morrow, for whom an equal number of our troops will be set at liberty. Now that it has been decided to treat the Southern privateers as prisoners of war, it is possible that Colonel Corcoran will soon be released, and in Boston prominent citizens are arranging for a meeting to urge his case upon the attention of the government. An exchange of a privateer captain for him was refused on the grounds of inequality in rank.—*Sun.*

Hon. Alfred Ely, member of Congress from New York, late a prisoner at Richmond, had an interview with the President and Secretary Seward, yesterday, and it has been determined to place the rebel privateers now in New York and Philadelphia upon a footing as prisoners of war.—*Times.*

TUESDAY, FEB, 4th.

Congress.—In Senate. Feb. 3d. Mr. Pomeroy, (Rep., Kan.) offered a resolution asking the Secretary of War for all orders relative to the force in the military command of Kansas, and whether the same be commanded by Gen. Lane; whether any change has been made in the military orders, since Gen. Lane left the Senate to take charge of the force and whether Gen Hunter's order, (already published,) is in accordance with the orders of the War Department here.

Mr. Chandler, (Rep., Mich.) presented resolutions from the Legislatare of Michigan, reaffirming loyalty to the government, and hatred of traitors, and asking the Government to speedily put down the insurrection; favoring the confiscation of the property of the rebels; *and asking that as slavery is the cause of the war, it be swept from the land.*

Mr. Anthony, (Rep., R. I.) offered a resolution that the Committee on Patents, inquire into the expediency of making an appropriation to aid in the experiment of manufacturing flax as a substitute for cotton. Adopted.

House.—On motion of Mr. Baker, (Rep., N. Y.) it was resolved that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, be requested to inquire into the propriety of establishing, by law, a system for the free receipt and delivery by postmen, of all mail matter, in cities containing upward of 10,000 inhabitants, in conformity with the admirable and economical Post Office system of the principal cities of Europe.

Communication from the rebels.—Yesterday afternoon a flag of truce from Gen. Johnson, reached the outposts of Gen. McDowell's division. The dispatches were brought by Col. Harrison of the 2d Virginia Cavalry. He was permitted to proceed no further. The sealed communication was brought to headquarters here, by Capt. Druillard. The contents have not yet transpired.—*Cor. Tribune.*

Heavy firing is reported to have been heard near Roanoke Inlet.

Maine Asserts Her Rights.—The State Senators of Maine do not appear to be satisfied with the reasons given by Mr. Seward, in the letter referred to in our first page, for permitting the passage of British troops through their territory. In a sharp speech on the letter, Mr. Smart, Chairman of the Commitee on Foreign Relations, characterized it as a gratuitous piece of politeness not likely to be reciprocated. But the great difficulty seems to be that the consent of the State was not first asked, and Mr. Smart wishes all the world to understand that Maine, though far down East, has as keen a sense of her own honor, dignity and rights, as the great state of New York or any other state. New York, he thinks, would never submit to the passage of British troops over her territory, and why should Maine?—*Sun.*

WEDNESDAY, FEB 5th.

The Legislature of N. York has Resolved, if the Assembly concur, That in the opinion of the Legislature of the State of New York, Jesse D. Bright, a Senator of the United States from Indiana, is a traitor, and ought to be removed from his seat.

In Congress, yesterday, Mr. Pomeroy, [Rep., Kan.] asked to take up the resolution offered yesterday, relative to the command of the Department of Kansas, &c., and calling on the Secretary of War for the orders and directions in regard to supplies for that command, and whether it is to be commanded by Gen. Lane, and whether the orders have been changed since Gen. Lane left, and whether the order of Gen. Hunter is according to the orders of the War Department.

The Resolution was opposed by Mr. Carlisle of Viginia, but was passed.

Mr. Sumner, from the Committee on Foreign affairs, reported a bill authorizing the appointment of diplomatic representatives to the republics of Liberia and Hayti.—*World.*

The House spent a day in discussing the Treasury Note bill, in Committee of the Whole.—*Ib.*

War movements.—Troops have been ordered to Lexington, Missouri, as it has been ascertained that the rebels have made very disloyal demonstrations in that place. All the troops along the line of the Pacific Railroad, west of Jefferson City, are under marching orders.—*World.*

Capt. Appleton Oaksmith has come out with a manifesto, insisting that he is innocent of the crime charged against him, viz: that of being engaged in the African slave trade.

Jeff. Davis has sent word, under a flag of truce, to President Lincoln, that, in case the bridge burners in Missouri are hung, our Colonels Corcoran and Lee will meet a like fate. The *Herald* slates that a Cabinet meeting has been held on the subject.

The "Contrabands."—The condition of the negroes, or "contrabands," who have been deserted by their masters and are now enjoying the refuge of the Union army at Fortress Monroe, is occupying the serious attention of Major Gen. Wool. Over three thousand of these negroes are now receiving support, and are being employed in several camps, and their number is increasing every day. The difficulty of taking care of them is very great, inasmuch as many of them are composed of women and children, and reports have reached General Wool that these unfortunates are in some instances a source of embarrassment to the different military commanders under whose protection they have come, the Major General, has issued an order instituting a commission, composed of Colonel J. T. Cram, Inspector General, and Major Legrand B. Cannon, Aid-de-Camp, to investigate the condition of the contrabands and provide for their wants.

MELANCHOLLY ANNOUNCEMENT.

DEATH OF SAMUEL WILDE.

It is our sad duty to announce to our readers the decease of Mr. Samuel Wilde, merchant of this city, and Proprietor of the Principia. He died on Wednesday afternoon, after an illness of about 24 days. His first attack was of erysipelas, accompanied with fever, which afterwards became typhoid; to which was then added diphtheria. Against these accumulated diseases he held up for a time, but at last sank under them. His end was peace. A wise and good man is taken from us. He has entered his rest. To his family, to the church, to the poor, to the neighborhood, to the country, his loss, at this time, will be great. We are unprepared for a more extended Obituary notice, at this time.

The funeral will be on Saturday, Feb. 8th, at 2 P. M. in the 1st Cong. Church, corner South 3d and 11th Streets, Williamsburgh.

TO OUR PATRONS.

During the sickness of Mr. Wilde, arrangements were commenced for transferring the proprietorship of the Principia to a gentleman well qualified by experience in News-Paper publishing to carry forward the enterprize.

Some little time will be necessary to complete the arrangements preparatory to the issue of the Principia in an enlarged and improved form, with room for more news, and a greater variety of miscellaneous matter.

Subscribers will please be patient with us, for a few days; and in the mean time let us hear from them.

RIDICULE.

If there is a destroyer of good feeling, friendship, affection, and love; if there is one thing more than another that will change love to hatred, corrode the heart, and poison the mind, it is ridicule. We are most easily tempted and led away from right and duty, by ridicule. To avoid the shame, we compromise with our consciences, commit the greatest wrong; and in an hour, bowed in the dust with bitterness of spirit, oh! how deep is our repentance!

The hot breath of the desert sirocco is not more deadly than the voice of ridicule. We are afraid of it; we degrade ourselves to avoid it. It arouses the most fiendish passions; the eye flashes, the bosom heaves tumultuously over the feverish fire that rages within it, the heart beats wildly, and all control is gone.

Use it not! Life is too precious, love is too heavenly, friendship is too beautifully eloquent with happiness, to be destroyed thus thoughtlessly. Rather let every word, every thought, be weighed in the balances of your heart, stripped of every useless adorning, and then go forth to fall gently, smoothly, like spring-time rain drops, on the ears of your fellow mortals.

The Preacher tells us that "laughter is mad;" and the Proverb of the wise man adds a warning, that "the end of mirth is heaviness." The habit of looking too much at the ludicrous side of life, is always hurtful to the moral feeling. The pleasure is faint and vanishing, and leaves behind it an apprehension of disgrace. "It is not good to live in jest, since we must die in earnest."—*Christian Treasury.*

Family Miscellany.

From the Tribune.

THE PROHIBITED SONG.

In compliance with the request of several persons, we reprint the admirable poem by Whittier, which the Hutchinsons were not allowed to sing on the other side of the Potomac, Gen. Kearney and Gen. Franklin having solemnly declared it to be incendiary, whereupon Gen. McClellan has forbidden them to sing within his lines at all. Our readers will notice that this poem is suggested by a famous hymn of Martin Luther:

"EIN' FESTE BURG IST UNSER GOTT."
(LUTHER'S HYMN.)

We wait beneath the furnace-blast
The pangs of transformation:
Not painlessly doth God recast
And mold anew the nation.
Hot burns the fire
Where wrongs expire;
Nor spares the hand
That from the land
Uproots the ancient evil.

The hand-breadth cloud the sages feared,
Its bloody rain is dropping;
The poison plant the fathers spared
All else is overtopping.
East, West, South, North,
It curses earth;
All justice dies,
And fraud and lies
Live only in its shadow.

What gives the wheat field blades of steel?
What points the rebel cannon?
What sets the roaring rabble's heel
On the old star-spangled pennon?
What breaks the oath
Of the men o' the South?
What whets the knife
For the Union's life?—
Hark to the answer: SLAVERY!

Then waste no blows on lesser foes
In strife unworthy freemen.
God lifts to-day the vail and shows
The features of the demon!
O North and South,
Its victims both,
Can ye not cry,
"Let Slavery die!"
And union find in freedom?

What though the cast-out spirit tear
The nation in his going,
We who have shared the guilt must share
The pang of his o'erthrowing!
Whate'er the loss,
Whate'er the cross,
Shall they complain
Of present pain,
Who trust in God's hereafter?

For who that leans on His right arm,
Was ever yet forsaken?
What righteous cause can suffer harm
If He it's part has taken?
Though wild and loud
And dark the cloud,
Behind its folds
His hand upholds
The calm sky of to-morrow!

Above the maddening cry for blood,
Above the wild war-drumming,
Let Freedom's voice be heard, with good
The evil overcoming,
Give prayer and purse
To stay the Curse,
Whose wrong we share,
Whose shame we bear,
Whose end shall gladden heaven!

In vain the bells of war shall ring
Of triumphs and revenges,
While still is spared the evil thing,
That severs and estranges.
But, blest the ear
That yet shall hear
The jubilant bell
That rings the knell
Of Slavery for ever!

Then let the selfish lip be dumb,
And hushed the breath of sighing;
Before the joy of peace, must come
The pain of purifying.
God give us grace
Each in his place
To bear his lot,
And, murmuring not,
Endure and wait and labor!

For the Principia.

ROMANCE OF A BASHFUL YOUNG MAN.

[CONCLUDED.]

Twelve times has this our mundane sphere completed its wonted journey around the sun since Ethan Brown spent the summer in the "society" of B——, and lost his heart on May Carrol. Twelve years in which, with the exception of a year or two of fitful correspondence between Ethan and Will, they have neither seen nor heard from each other, and during which the waves of many events have quite washed away, in the young lady's heart, the memory of her boy lover.

It is a cold, blustering eve in January; but the occupants of the cozy back parlor at Col Morton's are quite unconscious of the world without,—so agreeable seems the particular nook of creation in which they are lodged. The gas sheds its cheerful light over a table on which books and papers are strewn in inviting carelessness; a young gentleman is reclining indolently on the sofa, with the Daily papers by his side, evidently more interested in the society of the merry group of young ladies, who are crocheting, reading, and chatting, than in the "Latest from Europe," or the "Financial Question." Twelve years has changed Charlie Morton but little, excepting that instead of being a young, inexperienced boy just on the threshold of life, and just beginning to be a "beau," he has passed the boundaries into old bachelorhood, is recognized in society as a "ladies' man," very agreeable, very witty, very convenient; and esteemed and admired accordingly. As his life is an outward life, entirely, all that time has added to him is the experience of just so many more years of social life; he has been to such and such places, seen such and such things, enjoyed the society of such and such girls, and is now in as good spirits, and just as much delighted with himself and every body else as ever.

But our May? Shall we be able to recognize her? Yes; there she sits, by the table, turning over the books and papers; now reading aloud some little article which strikes her fancy, and now joining in conversation with her cousins, Belle, Clara, and Charlie. Time has changed the winsome child-maiden of the past into the lovely, thoughtful, well-poised woman. Life, with her, has developed from within, not from without; and the soul-growth is written on the face. The expression of innocent joyousness has changed to that of deep, quiet happiness; of childish amiability, to womanly nobleness. Not that May is never joyous, and merry, and playful, but that those traits do not form her character; that they are but the surface, beneath which is a rich vein of thought and feeling which is the *true* May. Of all this Charlie is, of necessity, totally ignorant. He only knows that cousin May is a dear, sweet girl, as she always was, and that he thinks all the world of her; that to be sure she is quite given to reading books which he considers intolerably stupid and unintelligable, and seems to find pleasure in conversing with many who are to him decidedly prosy and uninteresting. But this is an amiable weakness. True, cousin May is not "brilliant" in society, does not take the least pains to "create a sensation," and has no talent for getting up "desperate flirtations;" but then she is good, and everybody loves her, and for "her style" she has'n't her match!

Clara Morton, at present doeply engaged in worsted crochet work, and also in a brisk argument with her brother on the question, "whether Miss Stanley's opera costume of last evening was becoming," is a dark-eyed beauty of twenty-two, and quite a star in the society in which she moves. Not a little dignified and haughty, the world calls her, and so she appears in general society, but very genial and warm hearted in the circle of her very dear friends. Her sister Belle is a merry, simple-hearted young maiden of seventeen.

"Come, May, give us your opinion! What are you poring over?"—exclaimed Clara, jumping up, and looking over her shoulder. "Poetry, eh! The last bit you favored us with was from a speech in Congress, I believe. You seem to be quite eclectic in your tastes to-night. 'Dream of Youth;' pshaw, havn't you passed your sentimental period yet, coz? Happy to say I was safely through mine before I was out of pantalets, and have been enjoying the practical realities of life, some years!" And catching the book away playfully, Clara seated herself in her cousins' lap, and began toying with her wavy brown hair.

"A very 'practical' young lady is my sister Clara, to be sure!"—responded Charles, from the sofa. "I believe she has spent the whole day, after her very late breakfast, in a kind of general flutter between laces and gauzes, and silks, and flowers, like a young humming bird; while her impracticable, poetic coz has only stitched away on little dark calico dresses for the "Home" children, like the busy bee she is!"

"Now, brother Charlie, I do contend I've been as industrious as May, and far more so than a certain young gentleman who has seen fit to lounge around all day, watching our motions! Of course I felt it my imperative duty to get up something a little novel and fancy for Mrs. Brown's party to-morrow night; and as for charity sewing, there are always plenty of old maids and benevolent (alias, gossipping) societies to do up that business, without harnessing my sweet cousin May into their train."

"Bravo, Miss Clara! So you own that it costs you girls days of labor to get yourselves up in such bewitching style, for an evening entertainment?"

"Of course it does! You men seem to think that all these things are a part of us, like the plumage of birds, and that we get up in the morning looking just so! You always want to see us looking so, and yet you seem to think it exceedingly foolish for us to spend any time or thought on our dress! What do you admire Mabel Richmond and Nellie Williams, and a dozzen others for? You think they are beautiful, and lovely, and charming, and all that—of course their dress has nothing to do with it; O, no! but just take off their laces, and gauzes, and flowers, dress them in dark calicos, and set them to washing dishes. Where would all their charms be *then*, eh?"

"My dear sister you overwhelm me with your invincible logic! The clearness of your views on the subject compels me to draw the inference that your practical nature has set itself to work, concentrating all its artillery, battering-rams, and weapons of war generally, for the purpose of storming the heart of some poor innocent, of my unhappy sex. Pardon me if I suspect you have marked for your victim the new literary star that has chanced to stray into our niche of the visible heavens."

"Really, cousin Charlie, you speak quite pathetically of your unhappy sex!" chimed in May. "One would be led to suppose that you know by experience somewhat of this 'storming' business!"

"Experience? dear coz, my heart has been riddled through and through, till there is scarcely enough left of it to set up as a target for a young practicioner to shoot at!" exclaimed the gentleman, putting his hand to the article in question.

"I think its quite time you surrendered, then," said May, laughing.

"Married? I know it; only there are *so* many girls that I like, I never can make up my mind which to take; and then, too, if I should succeed in overcoming this difficulty, I know every maiden but the fortunate one would be sure to die of a broken heart! But why don't *you* marry, coz? I'm sure it is'nt the fault of my sex."

"O, I hav'nt met my fate yet!"

"I don't believe but what 'Benton Bradley' is cousin May's fate!" exclaimed Belle; "for now I remember I've heard her say she admired his articles in the Federal Monthly so much!"

"Benton Bradley!" exclaimed May, "who wrote—"

"Yes, the very same. He's the one Charlie teases Clara about—the 'literary gentleman' who is to be at Mrs. Brown's party. And, O, May! I do believe now he would just suit you!" And Belle clapped her hands in an ecstacy of delight.

"If you please, Belle, you need'nt be quite so generous with him;" said Clara. "Perhaps some others may have a word to say about the disposal of so valuable a prize."

"To tell the truth, May," said Clara confidentially, when they had reached the seclusion of their own private apartment, "that Benton Bradley would be quite a conquest. You see he isn't a bit of a ladies man, does'nt go into society very much, and does'nt seem to be easily impressed with young ladies. Now that's something stimulating—I like that! I hav'nt met him but once. 'Benton Bradley' is only his *nom de plume*. He is Mrs. Brown's brother-in-law, so I'm pretty sure he'll be there to-morrow night."

* * * * * * * * *

"To-morrow night" came, and with it the party, and with the party "Benton Bradley," alias, Mr. Brown: a tall, quiet, dignified young gentleman, of apparently near thirty; with large brown eyes, high forehead, dark hair and beard, and expressive features. Not a "handsome" man, not at all "romantic appearing," but what would be called "fine looking." Being one of the first class writers for the Federal Monthly, and a little out of the usual course, he was a subject of particular interest to the young ladies. Not at all witty or brilliant was he in conversation; he had no faculty of "playing the agreeable," alias, saying a thousand pretty little nothings, to which girls feel it their duty to smile and seem pleased. But let him once become interested in some subject and he was by no means found deficient in conversational powers. When his deep, rich voice was heard it was in the utterance of thoughts worthy expression.

"Miss Carrol, allow me to present Mr. Brown to your acquaintance."

Why did the blood mount to the gentleman's temples? Why was the hand presented slightly tremulous, and the voice lower than usual? Simply because Ethan Allen Brown recognized in May Carrol his first love. That dream of womanhood which had haunted him so many years, that vision which had ever glided in between him and every other girl, that image which he had so often tried to picture to himself—there it stood before him. In the opening blossom he recognized the bud.

All this passed through his mind in a moment, and then he was conversing, in an easy, dignified manner, with Miss Carrol. May was surprised, as they chatted on and on, passing from one subject to another, that she should feel so entirely at home with one so much a stranger. How many subjects on which she had thought and felt, but which she had neaver dreamed of introducing to many of her friends, she seemed to glide into so naturally with Mr. Brown. They seemed to meet as on a common plane. And Ethan thought with what quiet, calm assurance he expressed his opinions and discussed questions with her to whom, in "lang syne," he had scarcely dared utter a word. Yet if he fancied her then, he *loved* her now! He thought of Wordsworth's poem—"She was a Phantom of Delight"—and how perfectly it described May Carrol.

The winter months passed quickly, all too quickly for Mr. Brown, who nearly every evening, strangely enough, found himself plodding the streets towards the residence of Col. Morton. It was not till he had come to be on quite social terms there, that he ventured to reveal himself to Miss Carrol as the rustic admirer of her early maidenhood; and when he did so he took the opportunity of saying a great deal more, in a low, earnest tone, which we were too polite to overhear, and of course can't begin to guess! We do know, however, that in just a year from that time there was a quiet little weddding in the——church, and May Carrol had become Mrs. Ethan A. Brown. L. G.

WHAT A BISHOP HAD TO DO.

A STORY FOR BOYS.

A cloudy morning often ushers in a fine day, and disappointments in early years are often followed by a life of prosperity.

Long ago, about two hundred and sixty years, a poor lad was seen traveling on foot in England. He carries over his shoulder, at the end of a stick, all the clothing he has in the world, and has in his pocket an old leather purse, with a few pieces of money, given him by his mother, when, with a throbbing, prayerful heart, she took leave of him on the road, a short distance from their own cottage.

And who was John? for that was his name. He was the son of poor, but honest and pious parents, small farmers in a village called Ugborough. John had six brothers and five sisters, all of whom had to labor hard on a farm for a living. He was a pious lad, and at fourteen used to assist the clerk in singing, and other parts of divine worship. When the old clerk died, John hoped to fill his place; but being disappointed in this, with the consent of his parents, he set out to get a living elsewhere.

At the city of Exeter, where he first went, he met with no success; but as he looked on the old cathedral, and in the bookseller's window, a strong desire arose in his mind to become a scholar, and at once he set off for the University of Oxford, a distance of some two hundred miles, walking the whole weary way. At night, he sometimes slept in barns, or on the sheltered side of a haystack. He lived chiefly on bread and water, with occasionally a draught of milk as a luxury.

Arrived in the splendid city of Oxford, his clothing nearly worn out and very dusty, his feet sore, and his spirits depressed, he knew not what to do.

He had heard of Exeter College in Oxford, and thither he went, and, to his great delight, was engaged by the cook as "scullion" to carry coals into the kitchen, clean pans and kettles, and do that kind of work.

His studious habits soon attracted the attention of the authorities, who admitted him in the College as a poor scholar, providing for all his wants. He studied hard, and was soon at the head of his class. He rose to great eminence as a scholar, was very useful as a minister of Christ; and years before his death, which took place when he was seventy-two, he visited his father and mother, who were delighted to see their son, not only a "great scholar," but a pious bishop.

Such was the history of Dr. John Prideaux, who used to say, "If I had been parish clerk of Ugborough, I should never have been Bishop of Worcester."

ANECDOTE OF GARIBALDI.

I have just read an anecdote containing a fine trait of Garibaldi, in a Genoese journal. A Corsican vessel, of one hundred and thirty tons, sailed from Corsica to load charcoal in the bay of Arzachena. It became surprised by bad weather in front of Caprera. Gen. Garibaldi saw the poor vessel, commanded by the captain, Tobia Baptiste Nicolini, apparently just about being lost. The general did not hesitate a minute. He got into his boat, boarded the vessel, seized the rudder, after some little discussion with the captain, and brought his knowledge of the coast to the aid of the vessel. The difficult point was happily rounded. The delighted captain took out of his purse, and offered the volunteer pilot all the money he chose to accept. The general declined, saying, "I thank you all the same, *mon brave;* yonder is Arzachena; follow your course; you have no more danger to fear." "But," said the captain, "take, at least, some tobacco, some wine, some brandy, or some rum." "Thanks, captain, for your offer, but I only drink water, and I only smoke when I have nothing to do." "But who are you, then?" asked the captain, "a seaman, who will not take pay or rum." "*Bon voyage,*" rejoined Garibaldi, who had already got into his boat. The captain, of the vessel arrived, very much amazed, at Madalena, and narrated his adventure to the seamen of Alexandre Demos' Emma, which happened to be there awaiting the orders of Garibaldi. The sailors asked for a description of the savior of the vessel. "Dame! a long, fair beard," said the captain, "a red shirt, old worn trousers, a slouched hat, a handkerchief twisted round his neck, great shoes, with nails in them." "Parblu," said one, "why, man, it was the General!" "What General are you talking of?" "Why, who but Garibaldi!" The captain remained fixed like the statue of the Commander. These occurrences are not, however, rare, at Caprera. Two days before, Monotti, son of Garibaldi, saved a Neapolitan schooner in distress.—*Correspondence of the Star.*

MAN'S DUTIES.—Every man is a missionary now and forever—for good or for evil, whether he intends or designs it or not. He may be a blot, radiating his dark influence outward to the very circumference of society; or he may be a blessing, spreading the benediction over the length and breadth of the world; but a blank he cannot be.—There are no moral blanks—no neutral characters. We are either the sower that sows and corrupts, or the light that illuminates, and the salt that silently operates; but dead or alive, every man speaks.

KINDNESS.—How sweet are the affections of kindness! How balmy the influence of that regard which dwells around our fireside. Distrust and doubt darken not the lustre of its purity; the cravings of interest and jealousy mar not the harmony of that scene. Parental kindness and filial affection blossom there in all the freshness of eternal spring. It matters not if the world is cold, if we can but turn to our own dear circle, and receive all that our heart claims.

GREEN POTATOES.—The shoots of potatoes exposed to light contain solanum—a powerful poison. The tubers of potatoes which are covered with earth from the light never contain this poison, but if exposed when growing they become green on the skin, which is a sign that this poison has been developed in them. On no account should green potatoes be given to persons or animals.—*Scientific Amer.*

A good man regrets more keenly an injustice he has inflicted on others than any that can be be put upon him.

The absence of legitimate employment has probably made more gamblers than avarice, more drunkards than thirst, and as many suicides as despair.

THE NATIONALITIES.

"*Their origin, elements, mission, responsibilities, duties and destinies.*"—A Discourse BY WM. GOODELL (Published in the *Principia* of Dec. 7) is now on sale in Tract form at our office, *in packages only*,—as follows:

By mail, postage prepaid, by us.		Delivered at the Office.	
5 copies for	15 cts,	5 copies for	12 cts,
10 " "	24 "	10 " "	20 "
20 " "	40 "	20 " "	32 "

☞No orders answered for less than 5 copies by mail, and to one *address*, in *packages as above*, to economize the postage.

The Salvation of our country secured by Emancipation.

A Discourse by Rev. Geo. B. Cheever, D. D., from Esther 4, 14.

PRICE 3 cents single, or 2 cents per copy for packages of 25, 50, or 100 copies.

POSTAGE, which must be pre-paid, one cent per copy. Letters to be post-paid, and to enclose 1 cent for letter carrier.

GOD'S WAY OF CRUSHING THE REBELLION.

A sermon by Rev. Geo. B. Cheever, D.D., preached in the Church of the Puritans, Sept. 29, 1861, from Isaiah 58, 6.

"Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?"

A limited supply of this able discourse, in tract form, in our hands. Those who wish for copies should send soon.

PRICE 3 cents each. POSTAGE.—One cent will cover either one, two or three copies. One cent is paid by us to the letter carrier here, for each letter we receive, and for this an additional cent should be enclosed.

THE GUILT OF SLAVERY AND THE CRIME OF SLAVEHOLDING,

Demonstrated from the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. By Rev. George B. Cheever, D. D., Pastor of the Church of the Puritans.

For Sale at the Office of the Principia, 339 Pearl Street, New-York. Price $1. Postage 23 cents.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the *Principia*: FOR CASH ONLY.

DEMOCRACY of CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., $1 50..... Postage 32 cts.
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., $1 00 Postage 23 c.
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., $0 50..... Postage 16 c.

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS.

FOR THE MILLIONS, INCLUDING

I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. Also a summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal opinions*, collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. AN APPENDIX contains extracts from State Constitutions, and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; *also*, sentiments of the Revolutionary fathers, &c.

PRICES of "*Our National Charters.*"

By mail, postage prepaid, by the Publisher.		Delivered at the Office; or sent by private conveyance, or express, as ordered, at the expense of the purchaser.	
Single copy	15 cents.	Single copy	12 cents.
For 4 copies	50 "	For 4 copies	38 "
9 "	1.00	9 "	75 "
12 "	1.30	13 "	1.00
20 "	2.00	20 "	1.50
31 "	3.00	28 "	2.00
		46 "	3.00
		100 "	6.00

In packages of more than 20 or 30 copies it is generally cheaper to send by Express, (where it can be done) than by Mail. But this may depend on the distance and directness of the route, and may be ascertained by experiment, or by inquiry at the nearest Express depot.

For sale by WILLIAM GOODELL, or M. B. WILLIAMS, Office of the Principia, 339 Pearl Street, New York. TERMS, CASH, always in advance.

N.B. All postages on Books, Pamphlets, and Tracts, must be paid *at our Post-Office in advance*, so that we cannot answer orders, as above, without having received *the postage money*, as well as the price of the publication.

☞ We have no books, pamphlets, or tracts for sale, except those advertised, above, and it is not convenient for us to receive orders for any others.

D. D NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 104 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK

s exposed to
The tubers of
e light never
ing they be-
his poison has
ld green po-
fic Amer.

ce he has in-
pon him.
as probably
nkards than

es, duties and
d in the *Princi-*
office, *in pack-*

the Office.

12 cts,
20 "
32 "

y mail, and to
e postage.

ancipation.
Esther 4, 14.
ages of 25, 50,

copy. Letters
er.

BELLION.
d in the Church

the bands of
that ye break

t form, in our

ver either one,
letter carrier
additional cent

RIME OF

ures. By Rev.
he Puritans.
l Street, New-

LL

Postage 32 cts.
0 Postage 32 c.
. Postage 16 c.

d the relative
Also a sum-
gal opinions,
the Constitu-
Constitutions,
very from the
ionary fathers,

Office; or sent
veyance, or ex-
ed, at the ex-
rchaser.

.... 12 cents.
.... 38 "
.... 75 "
....1.00
....1.50
....2.00
....3.00
....6.00

s, Office of the
ish, always in

s, must be paid
nswer orders,
y, as well as the

r sale, except
us to receive

NEW YORK